

THE
CATHOLICKS
DEFENCE
FOR THEIR
ADORATION
OF THE
Body and Blood
OF OUR
LORD,
As believed Really and Substantially present
IN THE
Holy SACRAMENT
OF THE
EUCCHARIST.

At OXFORD Printed, Anno 1687.

101
101

101
101

101
101

101
101

101
101

101
101

THESES of Adoration of the E U C H A R I S T.

CONTENTS.

I. **P**rotestant-Concessions. §. I.

2. Catholick-Affertions. §. I.

Presuppositions. §. I.

1. Of a Precept of giving Divine Worship to our Lord. §. 1.

2. Of our Lord's whole Person its being where his Body is. §. 2.

3. Of this Divine Person being supremely adorable wherever his Body is: Granted by Protestants. §. 3.
Not only in Virtue, but Substance. §. 5.

4. That this Presence of our Lord's Body and Blood is by Protestants affirmed in the Eucharist; and that this Body is then to be worshipped with supreme Adoration. §. 5.

5. Further affirmed; That Christ's Body and Blood are present not only to the worthy Communicant, but to the Symbols; and whilst present are to be adored. §. 7.

6. Granted by Daille, That tho' he and his believe not Christ's Body present in the signs, yet they, for this, break not Communion with those that hold it. §. 8.

Catholick

Contents.

Catholick Assertions.

1. *A Sign or Symbol to remain after Consecration distinct from the thing signified. §. 9.*
This external Sign to be all, that which is perceptible by the senses, of the Bread and Wine; tho' not their Substance. §. 10.
2. *The word Sacrament to be taken not always in the same sense, but sometimes for the Sign or Symbol; sometimes for the thing signified. §. 11.*
3. *Catholicks ground Adoration, not on Transubstantiation, (which, as also Consubstantiation, involves it) but on Real Presence with the Symbols: maintaining Adoration due, tho' Christ's Body were present, neither under the Accidents of Bread (as Catholicks say); nor under the Substance of Bread (as Lutherans say); but after some other unknown manner distinct from both. §. 17.*
4. *Supposing (not granting) Transubstantiation an error, yet if Corporal or Real Presence held by the Lutherans be true, Catholicks plead their Adoration warrantable. §. 18.*
5. *Supposing Real Presence an Error, and the Lutheran and Roman Church both mistaken; yet these latter, in such Adoration, as excusable from Idolatry, as the other. §. 19.*
6. *Supposing both the former Opinions Errors, and (indeed) no Presence of Christ's Body with the Symbols at all; yet such Adoration by the one, or the other of Christ (who is a true object of supreme Adoration, and only mistaken by them to be where he is not) cannot be termed such Idolatry, as is the professed worshipping of an Object not at all adorable. §. 21.*
7. *Whatever Idolatry it is called in a Manichean worshipping Christ in the Sun, or in an Israelite worshipping God in the Calves at Dan and Bethel, because adoring a fancy of their own, (and a good intention grounded on a culpable ignorance excuseth none from Idolatry;) yet since Daille, and perhaps others, allows a reasonable (tho' mistaken) ground of Adoration sufficient for avoiding the just imputation of Idolatry; hence*

Contents.

hence if Catholicks can produce a rational ground of their apprehending Christ present in the Eucharist, tho' possibly mistaken in it, they are to be excused from Idolatry, on the same terms. §. 22.

Catholicks Grounds for their Belief.

1. *Divine Revelation. §. 24.*
2. *The Declaration thereof by the supremest Church-Authority in Councils. §. 25.*
3. *The Testimony of Primitive Times. §. 26.*
4. *The Universal Doctrine and Practice of the later, both Eastern and Western Churches. §. 27.*
5. *Protestant Concessions. §. 28.*
8. *For these Grounds given by Catholicks, Idolatry by many Protestants of late but faintly charged upon the Church of Rome. §. 30.*
9. *Catholicks grant, That to adore what is believed to be Bread, or perform the external signs of Adoration to our Lord as present there, where the Worshipper believes he is not, is unlawful to be done by any whilst so perswaded. §. 33.*

There is a very large number of people who are
interested in the history of the country and
who are looking for information about the past.

The following is a list of the names of the people
who are interested in the history of the country.

Mr. John Smith

Mr. James Brown

Mr. Robert Johnson
Mr. William Davis

CATHOLICK Theses,

Concerning the

ADORATION of Christ's *Body* and *Blood*

IN THE

EUCCHARIST.

CONCERNING the Adoration of Christ's Body and Blood, and so §. 1.
of his Divine Person, as present in the Eucharist, 1. I shall
shew, *what in reason is or must be conceded by Protestants.*

2. Examine *what Catholics maintain.*

1. I suppose a general precept of giving *supreme and divine adoration* to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: And, that as Affirmative precepts (such as this is) do not oblige to every time, and place; so, if they are unlimited and general, they warrant the lawfulness of our practice of them in any time or place; nor is there any need of any particular divine command in respect of these (i. e. *places and times*,) without which command we may not obey them. [For, what absurdities would follow hence? For, Was our Saviour, when on Earth, never lawfully worshipped, but in place, or time, first commanded? Nor then, when he shewed and presented himself to them for some other purpose, than for adoration? as to teach them, to suffer for them, &c. Might not the *Magi* worship him lying in the Cratch, divested of all appearance of Majesty, without a special command from God?] But it is sufficient to warrant our practice of them; if, in respect of such time, and place, there be no express prohibition.

2. I suppose; that, *where-ever the Body of our Lord is, there is* §. 2.
his whole person; it being no more since his Resurrection to be a dead body, (for *Christ dieth no more*; Rom. 6. 9.) ; but having the Soul joyned with it: as likewise, ever since the Incarnation, having also its *hypostasis* or subsistence from the Divinity joyned with it; even when it was in the Grave, and the Soul severed from it.

S. 3.

3. I suppose, it is a thing granted also by learned Protestants, That, *where ever this Body of our Lord is present, there this Divine Person is supremely adorable*: As the Divinity every where present is every where adorable, and may be so adored in the presence or before any of his Creatures; if such adoration be directed to him, not it, (as, when I see the Sun rising, I may lawfully fall down on my knees, and bless the Omnipotent Creator of it; and see 1 Cor. 14. 24, 25.) *may be*, I say, but not, *must*: for where there is only such a general presence of the Divinity; as is in every *time, place, and thing*; here our Adoration may and must be dispensed with, as to some times, and places.

None likewise can deny, That the Humanity of our Lord also, in a notion abstractive from the Divinity personally united to it, is truly adorable; tho' this with a worship not exceeding that due to a Creature.

S. 4.

[For the lawfulness of Adoration, where ever is such a presence of the person of our Lord, see Bishop Andrews, *Resp. ad Apol.* p. 125. *Christus ipse Sacramenti res [sive] in & cum Sacramento, sive extra & sine Sacramento, ubi-ubi est, adorandus est.*

Apol. des
Eglis. Re-
form. c. 10.

Thus also Daille, *Apol. des Eglis. Reform. c. 10.* who, in pitching especially on this point, *Adoration of the Eucharist*, as hindring the Protestants longer stay in the Roman Communion, hath in this Discourse, and in two Replies to Chaumont made afterward in defence of it, discussed it more particularly than many others) in answer to S. Ambrose and S. Austin their adoring the flesh of Christ in the Mysteries. — *The Humanity of Jesus Christ* (saith he) *personally united to the Divinity, is by consequence truly and properly adorable.* And again: *They only adored Jesus Christ in the Sacrament; which is the thing we agree to.* And *ibid.* p. 29. *We do willingly adore Jesus Christ, who is present in the Sacrament, namely by Faith in the heart of the Communicants, &c.* And see Dr. Stillingfleet in his *Roman. Idol. c. 2. p. 114.* — *The Question* (saith he) *between us, is not whether the person of Christ is to be worshipped with Divine worship, for that we freely acknowledge. And altho' the humane nature of Christ, of it self, can yield us no sufficient reason for adoration [he must mean, Divine]: yet being considered as united to the Divine Nature, that cannot hinder, the same Divine worship being given to his Person, which belongs to his Divine Nature; any more than the Robes of a Prince can take off from the honour due unto him.* Tho' how well that which he saith before, *ibid.* §. 2. (as it seems against worshipping Christ supposed present in the Eucharist, without a special command to do it) consists

consists with what he saith here, and with what follows, let him look to it.]

4. It is affirmed by many Protestants, especially those of the Church of England, that *this Body and Blood of our Lord is really present, not only in virtue, but in substance in the Eucharist*, either with the Symbols immediately upon the Consecration ; or at least so, as to be received in the Eucharist, together with the Symbols, by every worthy Communicant : and that this Body and Blood of our Lord, which is not severed from his Person, is then to be worshipped with supreme Adoration.

[See 1. for a *substantial* presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist, (I mean at least to the worthy Receiver, contradistinct to a Presence by *effect* only, Influence, Virtue, Grace, or the Holy Spirit, uniting us to Christ's Body in Heaven) Dr. Taylor of *Real Presence*, p. 12. *When the word Real* (saith he) *is denied* [i. e. by Protestants, as it was in King Edward's time] *the word Real is taken for Natural*, [i. e. as he explains it p. 5. including not only the nature of the Body, for that is the substance ; but the corporal and natural manner of its existence : he goes on,] *But the word substantialiter is also used by Protestants in this question, which I suppose may be the same with that which is in the Article of Trent ; Sacramentaliter præsens Salvator substantia sua nobis adest ; in substance, but after a Sacramental manner.* See the Confession of Beza, and the French Protestants (related by Hosp. *Hist. Sacram. part. ult. p. 251.*) *Fatemur in cæna Domini non modo omnia Christi beneficia, sed ipsam etiam Filii hominis substantiam, ipsam, inquam, veram carnem & verum illum sanguinem, quem fudit pro nobis, non significari duntaxat, aut symbolice, typice, vel figurate proponi tanquam absentis memoriam ; sed vere ac certo representari, exhiberi, & applicanda offerri, adjunctis symbolis minime nudis, sed quæ (quod ad Deum ipsum promittentem & offerentem attinet) semper rem ipsam vere ac certo conjunctam habeant ; sive fidelibus, sive infidelibus proponantur.*

Again, Beza Epist. 68. speaking against Alemannus, and some others, who opposed a *substantial* presence ; *Volunt* (saith he) *ex Gallica Confessione* [Art. 36.] *& Liturgia* [Catech. Din. 53.] *exungi substantiæ vocem, idcirco de industria passim a Calvino & a me usurpatam, ut eorum calumnia occurreremus, qui nos clamitant pro re Sacramenti non ipsum Christum, sed ejus duntaxat dona & energiam, ponere.* And Epist. 5. he argues thus against the same Alemannus. — *Velim igitur te imprimis intueri Christi verba ; Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis traditur, & Hic est sanguis me-*

us

us qui pro vobis funditur. — *Age pro his vocibus Corpus & Sanguis, dicamus, Hoc est efficacia mortis meae, quae pro vobis traditur; Hic est Spiritus meus qui pro vobis effunditur: Quid ineptius est hac oratione? Nam certe verba illa, Quod pro vobis traditur, & Qui pro vobis funditur, necessario huc te adigunt, ut de ipsamet Corporis & Sanguinis substantia hoc intelligere cogaris.*

See Hooker, Eccles. Pol. 5. l. 67. §. p. 357. *Wherefore should the world continue still distracted and rent with so manifold contentions; when there remaineth now no Controversy, saving only about the subject where Christ is? — Nor doth any thing rest doubtful in this, but whether, when the Sacrament is administred, Christ be whole within Man only; or else his Body and Blood be also externally seated in the very consecrated Elements themselves? [But a great Controversy surely there would be beside this, if the one party held Christ's Body substantially, and the other virtually present.] Again, p. 360.*

— All three opinions do thus far accord in one, &c. That these holy mysteries, received in due manner, do instrumentally both make us partakers of that body, and blood, which were given for the life of the World; and besides also impart unto us, even in true and real, tho' mystical, manner, the very Person of our Lord himself, whole, perfect, and entire.

Thus also Bishop Andrews, Resp. ad Apol. Bell. 1. cap. p. 11. *Nobis vobiscum de Objecto convenit, de modo lis omnis est.* [But there would be a *lis* concerning the Object, if one affirmed the substance of the body there, the other only the virtue, or efficacy.]

S. 5.
n. 2.

See Bishop Cosins his late *Historia Transubstantiationis*, tit. cap. 2. *Protestantium omnium consensus de reali, id est, vera, (sed non carnali) Praesentia Christi in Eucharistia manifeste constat.* And in proof of this p. 10. he quotes Poinet Bishop of Winchester, his *Dialecticon de veritate, natura, atque substantia Corporis & Sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia; Quod* (saith he) *non alio consilio edidit, quam ut fidem & doctrinam Ecclesiae Anglicanae illustraret. Et primo ostendit Eucharistiam non solum figuram esse Corporis Domini; sed etiam ipsam veritatem, naturam, atque substantiam in se comprehendere; idcirco nec has voces Naturae & Substantiae fugiendas esse; Veteres enim de hoc Sacramento differentes ita locutos fuisse. Secundo quaerit, an voces illae, Veritas, Natura, & Substantia, communi more in hoc mysterio a veteribus intelligebantur; an peculiari & Sacramentis magis accommodata ratione? Neque enim observandum esse solum, quibus verbis olim Patres usi sunt, sed quid istis significare ac docere voluerint. Et licet discrimen ipse cum Patribus agnoscat, inter Corpus Christi formam humani corporis naturalem habens, & quod*
in.

in Sacramento est Corpus mysticum; maluit tamen discrimen illud ad modum præsentia & exhibitionis, quam ad ipsam rem, hoc est, Corpus Christi verum accommodari; cum certissimum sit, non aliud Corpus in Sacramento fidelibus dari, nisi quod a Christo pro fidelium salute in mortem traditum fuit. Thus he, justifying Poinet's expressions speaking in the language of the Fathers. p. 43. — *Non dicimus* (saith he) *in hac sacra Cæna nos tantum esse participes fructus mortis, & passionis Christi; sed fundum ipsum cum fructibus, qui ab ipso ad nos redeant, coniungimus; afferentes cum Apostolo, 1 Cor. 10. 16. Panem quam trangimus esse uirgineum Corporis Christi, & Poculum Sanguinis ejus communicationem; imo in eadem illa substantia, quam accepit in utero Virginis, & quam sursum in celos in-venit; in hoc tantum a Pontificis dissidentes, quod illi manducationem hanc & conjunctionem, corporaliter fieri credunt; nos non naturali aliquaratione, aut modo corporali; sed tamen tam vere, quam si naturaliter aut corporaliter Christo conjungeremur.* [Here I understand his non modo corporali not to exclude Corpus Domini, or non ratione naturali to exclude natura rei, or the thing it self; but only to signify, that the Body is present, not after a corporal manner, or with the dimensions and other common qualities of a Body; which thing indeed Catholicks also affirm.]

He seems also to grant, this substantial Presence to be with the Symbols, after Consecration, on the Table, and before communicating. For p. 65. for this he quotes the Conc. Nican. *Sublata in altum mente per fidem consideremus, proponi in sacra illa mensa Agnum Dei tollentem peccata mundi.* And p. 43. — *Quoniam* (saith he) *res significata nobis offertur & exhibetur tam vere quam signa ipsa: ea ratione signorum cum Corpore & Sanguine Domini conjunctionem agnoscimus; & mutata esse elementa dicimus in usum alium ab eo quem prius habuerunt.* [i. e. to be now conjoyned with, and to exhibit to us this Body of our Lord: which conjunction, he saith p. 45. is made per omnipotentiam Dei.] So he saith *ibid.* — *Non queritur, An Corpus Christi a Sacramento suo, juxta mandatum ejus instituto ac usurpato, absit; quod nos Protestantes & Reformati nequaquam dicimus aut credimus. Nam cum ibi detur & sumatur, omnino oportet ut adsit; licet Sacramento suo quasi contextum sit, & ibi, ut in se est, conspici nequeat.* And p. 125. — *Fieri enim* (saith he) *de Elemento Sacramentum* [which surely is done in the Consecration] *nec consistere Sacramentum sine Re Sacramenti, firmiter tenent.* And this conjunctio Corporis Christi, p. 35. he affirms to be made in receiving the Sacrament, not only cum anima, sed etiam cum corpore nostro.

Lastly,

S. 5.
n. 3.

S. 5. n. 4.

Lastly, the *modus* of this true Presence of the Body of our Lord with the Signs or Symbols in the Sacrament, when as it remains in Heaven till our Lord's second coming, he makes, as others, to be *ineffabilis, imperscrutabilis, non ratione inquirendus aut indagandus*. p. 36. — *Nos vero hunc modum* [præsentia Christi in Eucharistia] *fatemur cum Patribus esse ineffabilem, atque imperscrutabilem, hoc est, non ratione inquirendum, aut indagandum; sed sola fide credendum.* * *Etsi enim videtur incredibile in tanta locorum distantia penetrare ad nos Christi carnem, ut nobis sit in cibum; meminisse tamen oportet, quantum supra sensus nostros emineat Spiritus Sancti virtus, & quam stultum sit ejus immensitatem modo nostro metiri velle. Quod ergo mens nostra non comprehendit, concipiat fides.* [The like to which *esse ineffabilem, & supra sensus*, Catholics say of the same presence of our Lord in the Eucharist in *tanta locorum distantia*, whilst also at the very same time it is in Heaven.] And thus Lanfrank long ago in his answer to Berengarius, (who contended that *Christi Corpus cælo devocari non poterit,*) quoting the words of St. Andrew a little before his Passion: — *Cum vero in terris carnes ejus sunt comestæ, & vere sanguis ejus sit bibitus; ipse tamen usque in tempora restitutionis omnium in cælestibus ad dextram Patris integer semper perseverat & vivat. Si quaris* (saith he) *modum quo id fieri possit; breviter ad præsens respondeo, Mysterium est fidei: credi salubriter potest, vestigari utiliter non potest.* See also the Gallican Confession, produced by this Bishop, p. 23. where they say, *Christus in cælis mansurus donec veniat*; and yet *nutriens & vivificans nos Corporis & Sanguinis sui substantia*, [i. e. in the Sacrament:] that *Hoc mysterium nostræ cum Christo coalitionis tam sublime est, ut omnes nostros sensus, totumque adeo ordinem naturæ superat.* In all these then doth not the incomprehensibility and supernaturality of this Mystery lie in this, that the one Body of our Lord should be at once in two places, viz. present at the same time in Heaven, and to us here in the Sacrament? And yet this Bishop seems to find some trouble in it, to make any other unexplicable or unintelligible mystery in the Catholics Transubstantiation, save only this. See p. 122. For the ceasing of the substance of the Elements by God's Omnipotency he allows very feasible; and then the Adduction of Christ's Body (pre-existent) in the place of their substance, labours under no other difficulty, save this, this Body its being at once in two places, here and in Heaven: nor, having twice * mentioned such a Sacramental Presence of our Lord, hath he replied any thing against it, but that thus the term of *Transubstantiation* is not rightly

*p. 122. &
p. 125

rightly applied to such an Adduction; which is a *Logomachy*. But this seems the difficulty and incomprehensibility that Protestants also confess in their Sacramental Presence of our Lord *in tanta locorum distantia pascentis nos in Eucharistia vera Corporis sui presentia & substantia*.

Lastly, after this Bishop, with others, hath so far conformed to S. 5. n. 5. the Expressions and Language of the Fathers, as to allow an Efferential or Substantial presence of Christ's Body, it seems he finds some of these Expressions also so far to advance toward a Substantial transmutation of the Elements, as that he saith, p. 113. — *Non abnuimus, nonnulla apud Chrysostomum aliosque Patres inveniri, quæ emphatice, immo vero Hyperbolice de Eucharistia prolata sunt: Et quæ, nisi dextre capiantur, incautos homines facile in errores abducent*. And below: *Sanctissimi Patres quo hæc auditorum animis vehementius & efficacius imprimerent, de Typis, tanquam si essent ipsa Antitypa, Oratorum more multa enunciant*. And again, p. 117. *Si verba [i. e. of some of the Fathers] nimis rigide urgeantur absque intellectu Sacramentali; nihil aliud ex iis colligi potest, quam Panem & Vinum proprie & realiter ipsam Christi Corpus & Sanguinem esse; quod ne ipsi quidem Transsubstantiatores admittunt*. Where he granting the expressions of some of the Fathers so high as to transcend the Assertions of Catholicks, or Transsubstantiators; whose Assertions again transcend those of Protestants in this Mystery: it seems not reasonable, that he should after this depress and extenuate their meanings, to countenance and comply rather with that Opinion that is farther distant from their expressions. Neither will the same Fathers calling, in other places, the Elements *Symbols* and *Signs* of Christ's Body, (as he pleadeth p. 116.) afford him that relief he seeks for from it. For since the Catholicks, as well as Protestants, do firmly maintain and profess an external Symbol, as well as the thing signified in the Eucharist, viz. all that is perceived by our senses, and that is visible, gustable, or tangible, of the *Elements*; as the Protestants contend this Symbol to be not only these, but the very Substance and nature of the Elements also: here it will be found that these sentences of the Fathers do suffer much less force and torture, if understood according to the *Symbol* supposed by Catholicks, than that by Protestants. For example, the Bishop * hath mentioned * P. 120. that passage of the ancient Author *de Cæna Domini* in S. Cyprian's Works: the words are these; — *Panis iste quem Dominus discipulis porrigebat, non effigie sed natura mutatus, Omnipotentia Verbi factus est caro: & sicut in persona Christi Humanitas ap-*

parebat, & latebat Divinitas; ita Sacramento visibili ineffabiliter divina se effudit essentia. Here, I say, if the *Sacramentum visibile*, and the external Symbol be taken in this Bishops way, for *substantia* or *natura panis*, all is extremely forced, and confounded; and so he is driven to expound it, that by *mutatio natura panis* is meant only *mutatio usus**; the change of which use of the Bread also seems no object of God's Omnipotence. But the Symbol or Sacrament being taken for such as the Catholicks make it, *viz.* for the external *Effigies* or Sensibles of the Bread, all is good sense and coherent, and nothing strained: and the *Omnipotentia Verbi* rightly applied to the *mutatio natura panis*: as God's Omnipotency may be observed in the Fathers to be frequently urged, not only in relation to the presence of our Lord's Body and Blood there, but also to the transmutation of the Elements there, whilst the exteriors of them still remain. But now in the last place, supposing the *natura panis* to remain, which the Father saith is changed, yet so long as these Divines maintain according to the Doctrine of the Fathers a substantial presence of our Lord's Body in the Eucharist, and that with the Symbols (as he saith *p. 45. Sacramento suo quasi connectum*); tho' they will not admit such a Symbol as the Catholicks, and a Transubstantiation of the Elements: yet they must (if complying with the Fathers) at least confess some kind of Consubstantiation or conjunction of the substances of Christ's Body and of the Elements in the Eucharist; to which opinion the sayings of the Fathers constrained *Luther*, as he often professeth. Mean while if it be asked, why such a Consubstantiation is declined by Catholicks? their answer is ready; *viz.* because the greatest *Councils* that have been held successively in the Church-Catholick, upon and since the agitation of this controversy, have frequently and constantly stated and delivered, That the Scriptures, as understood and expounded by the Fathers and Church-Tradition, declare a Transubstantiation; in the Judgments of which Councils Catholicks hold it their Duty to acquiesce. *This of a Substantial Presence asserted by Protestants.*

* §. 6.
n. 1.

2. Next, for *Adoration* too of this Body, as there present either with the Symbols upon their Consecration, or at least to all worthy receivers, see the same Bishop *Andrews, ib. c. 8. p. 195*; where to what *Bellarmin* hath said, *Inter novitia & nupera dogmata ponit Adorationem Sacramenti Eucharistia, i. e. adorationem Christi Domini in Sacramento, miro, sed vero modo presentis*, he answers thus: *Sacramenti ait, id est, Christi Domini in Sacramento. Rex autem Christum in Eucharistia vere presentem, vere & adorandum statuit,*

statuit, rem scil. Sacramenti; at non Sacramentum. And — Nos vero & in mysteriis carnem Christi adoramus, cum Ambrosio; & non id [i. e. Sacramentum] sed eum, qui super altare colitur, [i. e. Christum rem Sacramenti.] And is not this res Sacramenti worshipped as upon the Altar too with the Symbols there?

Since him, Bishop *Bramhal* to the Bishop of *Chalcedon*, * asking, * Rep. to Chalced. 2. c. p. 57. how the Protestants could profess to agree in all essentials of Religion with the Roman Church, which they held to be an idolatrous Church, *i. e.* in worshipping the Sacrament as their God? thus replies: *The Sacrament is to be adored, said the Council of Trent: The Sacrament, i. e. formally the Body and Blood of Christ, say some of your Authors, [where he quotes Bellarmin de Sacramento, 4. l. 29. c.] we say the same. [So Cardinal Bellarmin and Bishop Bramhal are agreed about this Adoration of our Lord in the Eucharist.] The Sacrament, i. e. the species of Bread and Wine, say others: that we deny, and esteem it to be idolatrous. Should we charge the whole Church with Idolatry for the Error of a party?*

The same concession with the same distinction makes the §. 6. French-Protestant Divine *Daille*, in his second Reply to *Chaumont*, n. 2. p. 29. *There is a vast difference between to adore the Sacrament, and to adore Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, or in the Mysteries. — The later of these we freely do, since we believe him God blessed for ever together with the Father. And afterward, in answer to the Fathers: They speak (saith he) of the Flesh of Jesus Christ in the Mysteries, (of which we do not contest the Adoration) and not of the Eucharist. And again: They only adored Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, which is the thing we agree to. And in his Apology, Ch-p- he saith concerning the Body of Christ if in the Sacrament, That it is evident, that one may, and that one ought to worship it; seeing that the Body of Christ is a subject adoreable. And Chap. 10. he grants upon Adorate scabellum, — That the faithful cast down themselves before the Ark to adore the Lord there, where the Divine Service was particularly joyned to the place where the Ark was. Dr. Taylor saith *, — Concerning the action of Adoration, it is a fit address in the day of Solemnity with a sursum corda, with our hearts lift up to Heaven, where Christ sits (we are sure) at the right hand of the Father. For, nemo digne manducat, nisi prius adoraverit, &c. [which, rightly understood, means illud quod manducat.] Here the Doctor allows adoring in the the Sacrament Christ as in Heaven. But if Christ's Body (and so himself in a special manner) be substantially present in the Eucharist, here on Earth; why not adore him, not only as in Heaven, but as present here? See elsewhere, Real*

* Real presence, §. 13. n. 5.

Pres. p. 144. where he saith, *We worship the flesh of Christ in the Mysteries exhibiting it to our Souls.*

§. 6. n. 3. See Spalatensis de rep. Eccles. l. 7. c. 11. §. 7. &c. — *Si secundum veritatem qui digne sumit sacramenta corporis & sanguinis Christi, ille vere & realiter corpus & sanguinem Christi, in se corporaliter, modo tamen quodam spirituali, miraculoso, & imperceptibili, sumit; omnis digne communicans adorare potest & debet corpus Christi quod recipit.* [Is then the worthy Communicant to worship, but not the unworthy; because Christ's Body is there present to the one, but not to the other?] *Non quod lateat corporaliter in pane, aut sub pane, aut sub speciebus & accidentibus panis; sed quod quando digne sumitur panis sacramentalis, tunc etiam sumitur cum pane Christi corpus reale, illi communioni realiter præsens.* Thus Spalatensis.

And so Bishop Forbes, de Euchar. 2. l. 2. c. 9. §. — *An Christus in Eucharistia sit adorandus, Protestantes saniores non dubitant. In sumptione enim Eucharistiae (ut utar verbis Archiepiscopi Spalatensis) adorandus est Christus vera latria, siquidem corpus ejus vivum, ac gloriosum, miraculo quodam ineffabili digne sumenti præsens adest; & hac adoratio non pani, non vino, non sumptioni, non comestioni, sed ipsi Corpori immediate, per sumptionem Eucharistiae exhibito, debetur, & perficitur.* [Thus then Protestants allow Adoration to Christ's Body and Blood, as substantially present in the Eucharist, if not to the Symbols, yet to the worthy receiver.]

§. 7. 5ly. Yet further; It is affirmed by another party of Protestants, the Lutherans, more expressly, that Christ's body and blood are present, not only to the worthy Communicant, but to the consecrated Symbols; and whilst so present, which is during the action of the Lord's Supper, (i.e. as I conceive them, from the Consecration till the end of the Communion) are to be adored.

[Of which thus Chemnitius, Exam. Conc. Trid. part. 2. sess. 13. c. 5. *Deum & Hominem in Divina & humana natura, in actione Cæna Dominica vere & substantialiter presentem, in spiritu & veritate adorandum, nemo negat; nisi qui cum Sacramentariis vel negat, vel dubitat de presentia Christi in cæna.* Ibid. — *Et quidem humanam etiam ejus naturam, propter unionem cum Divinitate, esse adorandam, nemo nisi Nestorianus in dubium vocat.* — Ita Jacob Gen. 28. Moses Exod. 34. Elias 3 Reg. 19. non habebant sane peculiare mandatum, ut in illis locis Deum adorarent: sed quia habebant generale mandatum ut Deum ubique adorarent, & certi erant Deum sub externis & visibilibus illis symbolis vere adesse, & peculiari modo gratiæ se ibi patefacere; certe Deum ipsum, quem ibi presentem esse credebant, adorabant. Nec vero Deum illi procul in cælo Empyreo a se remotum

& absentem, sed vere presentem, & quidem peculiari modo gratia presentem, adorarunt. — Thus he. Nor do I know, that the Calvinists have at any time accused their brethren the Lutherans of Idolatry in such a practice. I find also Mr. Thornlike in the like manner clearly maintaining, 1. A presence of Christ's Body with the symbols, immediately upon Consecration: and, 2. An Adoration due to it. See the former, in *Epilog. l. 3. c. 2.* and, 3. where p. 17. *I have said enough* (saith he) *to evidence the mystical and spiritual presence of the flesh and blood of Christ in the Elements, as the Sacrament of the same, before any Man can suppose that spiritual presence of them to the soul, which the eating and drinking Christ's flesh and blood spiritually by living Faith importeth.* And see the latter, *ib. c. 30. p. 350.* — *I suppose* (saith he) *that the Body and Blood of Christ may be adored where-ever they are; and must be adored by a good Christian, where the custom of the Church, which a Christian is obliged to communicate with, requires it.* — This honour [*i. e.* of worshipping the Body and Blood of Christ] being the duty of an affirmative precept, (which, according to the received rule, tyes always; tho' it cannot tie a Man to do the duty always, because he then should do nothing else:) what remains but a just occasion to make it requisite, and presently to take hold and oblige? And is not the presence thereof in the Sacrament of the Eucharist a just occasion presently to express by the bodily act of Adoration, that inward honour, which we always carry toward our Lord Christ as God? — Again p. 351. Not to balk that freedom (saith he) which hath carried me to publish all this: I do believe that it was so practised and done [*i. e.* our Lord Christ really worshipped in the Eucharist] in the ancient Church, and in the symbols before receiving; which I maintain from the beginning to have been the true Church of Christ, obliging all to conform to it in all things within the power of it. I know the consequence to be this, That there is no just cause why it should not be done at present, but that cause which justifies the reforming of some part of the Church without the whole: which, were it taken away, that it [this adoration] might be done again, and ought not to be, of it self alone, any cause of Distance [*i. e.* between the Churches of Christ.]

6. It is granted by Daille in his *Apology*, c. 11. and in his defence of it against Chaumont, 1. That altho' the Reformed of his party, do not believe the presence of Christ's body in the Signs, yet they esteem not the belief of it so criminal, that it obligeth them to break off communion with all those that hold it. So that, had the Roman Church no other error, save this, they freely confess, it had given them

*Reply to
Chaumont,
p. 63.

* Conc.
Trid. sess.
13. 5.

them no sufficient cause of separating from it : as (saith he) *appears in this, that we tolerate and bear with it in the Lutherans.* And again, * for the adoration of this Body as so present with the signs, (when indeed it is not so,) he saith, — *That it is only vain and unprofitable, and that, as one may say, falls to nothing ; being deceived not in this, that it makes its addresses to an object not adorable ; but in this only, that mistaking it, it seeks it, and thinks to embrace it there where it is not.* And c. 12. he also freely confesseth, *That had the Church of Rome only obliged them to worship Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, and not used this expression, that the service of Latria ought to be rendered to the Holy Sacrament : * [she had not obliged them by this to adore any Creature.* Thus he, as it were constrained thereto by the *Lutherans* Protestants Opinion and Practice, for his retaining their Communion, and freeing them from Idolatry. 2. It is granted also, *Apol. c. 11.* — *That when our Lord was on Earth, a Disciple's giving divine honours, upon mistake, to another person much resembling him, would be no Idolatry.* So, supposing the Consecrated Host were truly adorable, granted, that should any one see one on the Altar, that hapned not to be Consecrated, and Worship it, neither would such a person be guilty of Idolatry. So he pronounces him blameless, that should give the Honour and Service due to his true Prince to a Subject, whom, very like, he took for his Prince. Yet that a *Manichean* worshipping the Sun, mistaken to be the very substance of Christ, (see *S. Austin contra Faustum* l. 12. c. 22. l. 20. c. 9.) for *Christ* ; or (to represent the opinion more refined) worshipping with divine honours not the Sun, but only Christ in the Sun, he could not in this be excused from Idolatry. And, that that which distinguishes these cases, and renders them so different, is, not a good intention to worship only him that is truly God, or Christ ; nor the opinion and belief Men have, that the Object they worship is truly such ; for this good intention (as he in that Chapter, and other Reformed Writers, and among others *Dr. Stillingfleet*, copiously press) is common to the worst of Idolaters, as to the rest : but the error or ignorance of the Judgment, from which flows this mistaking practice ; as that is perversly affected and culpable, or innocent and excusable. Of which thus he, *Ibid.* — *I maintain, that ignorance excuseth here when it is involuntary ; when the subject* [I add, or the presence of it] *we mistake in, is so concealed, that whatever desire we have, or pains we take, to find out the truth, it is not possible for us to discover it.* — *But there, where the ignorance of the Object* [or of its presence] *proceeds not from the ob-*
scu-

scurity or difficulty of the thing, but from the malice or negligence of the person; this is so far from excusing, that it aggravates our fault. Thus he excuses one that should have adored a person much resembling our Lord, or an unconsecrated Host, —because no passion or negligence of his caused such a mistake: —but not those who worshipped the Sun for Christ, [or Christ in the Sun;] —because (saith he) the ignorance of such people is visibly affected and voluntary, arising from their fault only, and not from the obscurity of the things they are ignorant in. Nor so Roman Catholicks in their worshipping the Sacrament for Christ; because (saith he) the error proceeds entirely from their passion, and not any thing from abroad. [Thus he, clearing such actions from Idolatry, where the error of the judgment is no way perverse, voluntary, and culpable.]

Having hitherto shewed you several Concessions of Protestants, and having urged none here from any of them, but such as I think all will, or in reason ought, to admit; next I proceed to examine, what it is that in this matter Catholicks do maintain.

1. And first, Catholicks affirm in the Eucharist, after the Consecration, a sign or symbol to remain still distinct; and having a diverse existence from that of the thing signified, or from Christ's Body contained in, or under it. [See Conc. Trident. sess. 13. c. 3. *Hoc esse commune Eucharistiae cum aliis Sacramentis, ut sit symbolum rei sacrae, & visibilis forma invisibilis gratiae.* By which form a visibilis (as Bellarmin expounds it, *de Eucharist.* 4. l. 6. c.) is meant the species of the Elements, not the Body of Christ. — So Bellarmin, *Euchar.* 2. l. 15. c. *Etiam post consecrationem species panis & vini sunt signa corporis & sanguinis Christi ibi revera existentium.* — And 3. l. 22. c. *Accidentia remanent; quia si etiam accidentia abessent, nullum esset in Eucharistia signum sensibile; proinde nullum esset Sacramentum.* So Estius in 4. sent. 1. dist. 3. §. *Eucharistia constat ex pane, tanquam materia quadam partim transeunte, partim remanente; transeunte quidem secundum substantiam; remanente vero secundum accidentia, in quibus tota substantia vis & operatio nihilominus perseverat.* Hence they allow of that expression of Irenaeus, 4. l. 34. c. where he saith, — *Eucharistiam ex duabus rebus, terrena & caelesti, compositam esse.* And of S. Gregory, *dial.* 4. l. 58. c. *In hoc mysterio summa imis sociari: terrena caelestibus jungi: unum ex visibilibus ac invisibilibus fieri.*] — So that tho' these symbols and Christ's Body may be said to make *unum aggregatum*; yet, if this be only the species or accidents of the Bread and Wine that remains, these cannot be said to have any inherence in this Body of Christ, (tho' it is true on the other side that, being accidents

§. 9.
Assertions.

cidents only, they cannot be said to make a distinct *suppositum* from it;) or, if a substance remain, this cannot be said to have any hypostatical union (or to make one *suppositum*) with our Lord's Divinity or Humanity, as our Lord's Humanity hath such an union with his Divinity. From which it is observed by Dr. Taylor (*Real Presence*, p. 336.) That therefore still there is the less reason for *Romanists* to give any Divine worship (as he saith they do) to the symbols. Far therefore are Catholics from granting (what a late Author * pretends they do, but that which he alledgeth no way shews it) as great an hypostatical union between Christ and the Sacrament, as between the Divine and Humane Nature.

* Stillight.
Rom. Idol.
P. 128.

§. 10. This external sign or symbol they also affirm to be *all that* of the Bread and Wine that is *perceived* by any *sense*. And tho' after such Consecration the substance of the Bread and Wine is denied to remain yet is *substance* here taken in such a sense, as that neither the hardness nor softness, nor the frangibility, nor the savour, nor the odour, nor the nutritive virtue of the Bread, nor nothing visible, nor tangible, or otherwise perceptible by any sense, are involved in it. Of which signs also they predicate many things, which they will by no means allow to be properly said of, or at least to be received in, or effected by, or upon *Christ's* Body, now immortal and utterly impassible. So *sapere, digeri, nutrire, confortare, corporaliter*; and again, *frangi dentibus, comburi, rodi a brutis animalibus*, and whatever other things may be named (excepting only those attributes, which in general are necessary to indicate the presence of *Christ's* Body to us with the *species* whilst *integræ*; as the local positions, *elevare, recondi, ore recipi*, &c.) they apply to these symbols that remain; not to *Christ's* Body which is indivisibly there. — *Christus vere in sacramento existens nullo modo ladi potest; non cadit in terram*, [id enim proprie cadit (saith he) quod corporaliter movetur; so also, anima non cadit,] *non teritur, non roditur, non putrescit, non crematur: illa enim* (saith Bellarmine *) *in speciebus istis recipiuntur, sed Christum non efficiunt.*

* De Eucharist. 3.
l. 10. c.

§. 11.

2. Concerning Adoration of the Sacrament, they affirm the word *Sacrament*, not to be taken always in the same sense; but sometimes to be used to signify only the *external signs* or symbols; sometimes only the *res Sacramenti*, or the thing contained under them, which is the much more principal part thereof. And, as Protestants much press, so Catholics willingly acknowledge, a great difference between these two, the worshipping of the *Sacrament*, as this word is taken for the symbols, and the worshipping of *Christ's* Body in the

the Sacrament. Now as the word *Sacrament* is taken for the *Symbols*, they acknowledge a certain inferior cult and veneration due thereto, as to other holy things, the holy Chalice, the holy Gospels, the holy Cross, &c. of which Veneration much hath been spoken in the Discourse of Images, §. 42. &c. but they acknowledge no supreme or divine Adoration due to the Sacrament, as taken in this sense for the Symbols; but only to our Lord's Body and Blood, and so to our Lord himself as present in this Sacrament, or with these Symbols. [So that be these Symbols of what latitude you will, either larger, as the *Lutheran* believes; or straiter, as the *Catholics* say they are; or be they not only these, but the substance of bread also under them, as *Catholics* believe it is not: yet neither those species, nor this substance, have any divine Adoration given or acknowledged due to them at all; no more than this substance of bread, believed there by the *Lutherans*, yet hath from them any such Adoration given to it.]

[That *Catholics* thus by Adoration of the Sacrament with *La-* §. 12:
tria only understand that of the *res Sacramenti*, the Adoration of
Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament, see *Conc. Trid. sess. 13.*
c. 5. Omnes Christi fideles, pro more in Catholica Ecclesia semper
recepto, latría cultum, qui vero Deo debetur, huic sanctissimo Sacra-
mento in veneratione exhibeant. Neque enim ideo minus est ado-
randum, quod fuerit a Christo Domino, ut sumatur, institutum; nam
illum eundem Deum presentem in eo adesse credimus, quem Pater
aternus introducens in orbem terrarum dicit, Et adorent eum omnes
Angeli Dei: quem Magi procidentes adoraverunt. Where, tho'
the Council useth the expression of exhibiting *latría cultum Sacra-*
mento; yet that this *cultus latría* is not applied to the Sacrament,
as it implies the Sign or Symbol, but only the thing signified,
both the words joined to it, *qui vero Deo debetur*, (which signi-
fies the Council maintains that to be God they gave this *cultus la-*
tria to) and the explication annexed, *Nam illum eundem Deum, &c.*
may sufficiently convince to any not obstinately opposite. Nei-
ther do those words interposed, — *Neque enim ideo [Sacramentum]*
minus est adorandum, quod fuerit a Christo Domino, ut sumatur, institu-
tum, any way cross such a sense, as a late Author* too confidently
presseth, saying, — That by Sacrament here the Council must un-
derstand the Elements or Accidents as the immediate term of that divine
worship, or else the latter words [i. e. *quod fuerit a Domino institu-*
tum ut sumatur] signify nothing at all. For what (saith he) was
that, which was instituted by the Lord as a Sacrament? was it not
the external and visible Signs, or Elements? why do they urge, That
the

* *Stillings-*
fleet, Rom.
Idol. c. 2. §.
2. P. 117.

the Sacrament ought not the less to be adored, because it was to be taken, *but to take of the common objection*, That we ought not to give divine worship to that which we eat? *And what can this have respect to, but the Elements?* Thus argues he. When as he might know, that the Fathers of *Trent*, who said this, do hold, the chief thing instituted and exhibited in the Sacrament to be, not the Elements, but Christ's Body; and *ipsum corpus Domini* to be also orally both taken and eaten, (tho' not *modo naturali carnis* or *corporis*) as well as the Elements, according to our Lord's express words, *Accipite, Manducate, Hoc est Corpus meum*, [i.e. *quod manducatis*:] and when-as he might know also, that the occasion of adding this clause was in opposition to a party of *Luther's* followers, who, granting Christ's Body present with the Symbols, and yet denying Adoration, said for it, that our Lord's Body [not the *Symbol*] was present there, *non ut adoretur, sed ut sumatur*. And *Calvin* also saith some such thing, *Institut.* l. 4. c. 17. §. 35. urging, there was no such mandate for Adoration, i. e. of Christ's Body, of which he was formerly speaking; but that our Lord commanded only, *accipite, manducate, bibite*, —quo (saith he) *accipi* [or *sumi*, if you will] *Sacramentum*, *non adorari jubet*: meaning *Sacramentum* in relation to *Corpus Domini*; else he said nothing to the purpose of his former Discourse. And it may be consider'd here also, that not only the Council of *Trent*, but no Schoolman at all (some of which are thought uncautious in their expressions about Adoration of Images, and consequently of the holy Symbols in the Eucharist; nor is any Catholick accountable for them) takes the boldness to give *cultus latriæ* (*qui vero Deo debetur*, as the Council saith here) to the Elements, without annexing some qualification of a *coadoratio*, *per accidens, improprie, sicut vestes Regis adorantur cum Rege*, or *ut Rex vestitus adoratur*, yet without our mental notion at such a time stripping him of his Garments. Therefore neither can the Council here be rationally presumed to speak of the Symbols, when it useth no such qualifications.

§. 13.

But, to put this matter out of all doubt, the Definition of this Council in the 6th. Canon (more than which is not required to be professed by any Son of the *Roman Church*) is this: —*Si quis dixerit in sancto Eucharistæ Sacramento Christum unigenitum Dei Filium non esse cultu latriæ etiam externo adorandum*, — & *ejus Adoratores esse Idololatrias, Anathema sit*. Concerning which, and some other passages in this Council, in comparing the *Chapters* with the *Canons*, *Franciscus a sancta Clara*, *Enchiridion of Faith Dial.* 3. §. 18. judiciously observes, —*That altho' Catholick faith,*

as

as to the substance, is declared in the Chapters, (as indeed it is,) yet according to this we are obliged only sub anathemate to that form of expression which is defined in the Canons. 1. Because the Chapters are not framed in the stile of Conciliary Definitions, with Anathema's, and the like. 2. Because the Canons (where the very form is exceeding exact) sometimes differ from the manner of expression in the Chapters, in order to the same matter: As sess. 6. of Justification; Canon 11. and Chapter 7. also sess. 13. of the Sacrament of the Eucharist; Canon 6. Chapter 5. and elsewhere: yet sub anathemate all must stand to the Canons; and therefore must expound the Chapters by them. See more in the Author.

Soave also, l. 4. p. 343. in his censure of this 13th. Session, tho' he saith magisterially enough in opposition to a Council, — *That the manner of speech used in the 5th. point of Doctrine, saying, That divine worship was due to the Sacrament, was noted also for improper; since it is certain, that the thing signified or contained is not meant by the Sacrament, but the thing signifying or containing.* [But what Catholick will grant him this, that Sacrament includes not both; or, of the two, not more principally the thing contained in, or joined with the Symbols?] Yet he observes, — *That it was well corrected in the 6th. Canon, which said, That the Son of God ought to be worshipped in the Sacrament.* See the same observed also by Grotius in *Apolog. Rivet Discuss.* p. 79. where also he notes Bellarmin's forequoted passage: *That the Controversy between Catholics and Lutherans in their saying, The Sacrament, or Christ in the Sacrament, was to be worshipped, was only in modo loquendi: To which nothing is replied by Rivet in Dialysi Discussionis, but the matter there, as also in his Apologetic, passed over in silence.* Add to Grotius what Mr. Thorndike discourseth in defence of the expression of worshipping the Sacrament, *Epilog. 3. l. 30. c. p. 352.* *I confess it is not (necessarily) the same thing to worship Christ in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, as to worship the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Yet in that sense, which reason of it self justifies, it is. For the Sacrament of the Eucharist, by reason of the nature thereof, is neither the visible species, nor the invisible Grace of Christ's body and blood; but the union of both by virtue of the promise; in regard whereof --- both concur to that which we call the Sacrament of the Eucharist, --- by the promise which the Institution thereof containeth. If this be rightly understood, then to worship the Sacrament of the Eucharist, is to worship Christ in the Sacrament of the Eucharist.* Thus he.

This in vindication of the Council. And Bellarmine explains s. 14. himself in the same manner as the Council, in his *Apology to King*

James, *Inter nupera dogmata ponit* [Rex] *adorationem Sacramenti Eucharistia*, i. e. [as Catholicks understand and explain it] *adorationem Christi Domini miro, sed vero, modo presentis*. To which Bishop Andrews replies: — *Quis ei hoc dederit?* *Sacramento i. e. Christi in Sacramento*. Imo *Christus ipse Sacramenti res in Sacramento adorandus est*. Rex autem *Christum in Eucharistia vere presentem, vere & adorandum statuit*. [Thus far then the King, Bishop, and Cardinal are agreed] Again, *de Eucharistia* l. 4. c. 29. — *Quicquid sit de modo loquendi, status Quaestionis non est, nisi*, An *Christus in Eucharistia sit adorandus cultu patriæ?* And, as it were to avoid offence, when he comes to treat on this subject, *de Euchar.* 4. l. c. 29. he prefixeth the Title to it, not *De adoratione*, but *De veneratione hujus Sacramenti*: And in it saith that — *Nullus Catholicus est qui doceat, Ipsa symbola externa per se & proprie esse adoranda cultu patriæ, sed solum veneranda cultu quodam minore*.

Of this Doctrine of Catholicks Bishop Forbes gives this testimony, l. 2. c. 2. 9. §. *In Eucharistia mente discernendum esse Christum a visibili signo docent Romanenses; & Christum quidem adorandum esse non tamen Sacramentum: quia species illa sunt res create, &c. neque satis est* [i. e. to give them divine worship] *quod Christus sub illis sit: quia etiam Deus est in Anima tanquam in Templo suo; & tamen adoratur Deus, non Anima; ut ait Suares* 3. Tom. 79. quæst. 8. art. disp. 65. §. 1. And so *Spalatensis* l. 7. c. 11. n. 7. *Nam neque nostri* [i. e. Catholicks] *dicunt species panis & vini, hoc est, accidentia illa esse adoranda: sed dicunt corpus Christi verum & reale, quod sub illis speciebus latet, debere adorari*. When then the Roman Church, speaking of supreme Adoration, explains her language of *adoring the Sacrament*, to mean only *adoring Christ's Body*, and so Christ as present there; and not *adoring* any other thing whatever (substance, or accident) that is present there, or that is also included in the word *Sacrament*: that accusation, which her using such language of *adoring the Sacrament* can seemingly expose her to, is at the most, not of an error, but an improper expression. But the propriety of language dutiful Sons ought to learn from, not reach, their Mother; who also speaks that which hath descended to her from former times. Neither will it follow from Catholicks using the word *Sacrament* precisely in this sense, exclusively to any other matter save Christ's Body, that therefore one may use the word *Sacrament* promiscuously for Christ's Body, in what respect soever we speak of it; and, as well or as properly say, that the Sacrament, meaning Christ's Body,

Body, is in the Heavens at God's right hand, or was on the Cross, or the like. For tho' [*Sacrament*] thus applied involves no other subject or thing at all but Christ's Body; yet it *connotes*, besides it, the place or manner of its presence; signifying this Body only as present in the Mysteries; not as a term adequate to, and convertible with it, being in whatever time and place.

I think these Testimonies produced both out of the Council of *Trent*, and other *Catholick* Authors, and also out of *Protestants* confessing so much of them, do show sufficiently the great extravagancy of those *Protestant* Authors who tell their Readers, that the state of this controversy is not, Whether *Christ's Body*, and so Christ in the *Sacrament* be adorable with supreme Honours? but whether the *Sacrament*, and then by *Sacrament* are pleased to understand the *Symbols*? and then, to confute the Doctrine of *Rome*, argue, that no *Creature*, as the *Symbols* are, is capable of Divine Honour. The state of the Controversy (saith a late Writer of theirs *) is, Whether proper Divine Worship in the time of receiving the Eucharist may be given to the Elements on the account of a Corporal Presence of Christ under them? And against it he affirms, — That supposing the divine Nature present in any thing gives no ground upon that account to give the same worship to the thing wherein he is present, as I do to Christ himself. So Bishop Andrews, *Rex Christum in Eucharistia vere adorandum statuit, — at non Sacramentum, terrenam scilicet partem.* And — *Nos in mysteriis carnem Christi adoramus, Sacramentum [i. e. the Symbols] nulli adoramus.* So Dr. Taylor, (Real Presence p. 335.) The Commandement to Worship God alone is so express; the distance between God and Bread dedicated to the service is so vast, — that, if it had been intended that we should have worshipped the H. Sacrament, the H. Scriptures would have called it God, or Jesus Christ. And Dissuasive §. 5. p. 76. he affirms the Church of *Rome* to give Divine Honour to the Symbols or Elements, and so to a Creature the due and incommunicable propriety of God. So they vainly also undertake to shew, that the Primitive Church did not terminate their Adoration upon the Elements; that the Fathers, when they speak of worship, speak of worshipping the Flesh of Christ in the Mysteries, or Symbols; not of worshipping the Mysteries or Symbols. These, I say, are great extravagances: whilst the *Roman* Church owns or imposes no such Doctrine of Divine Adoration due to the Elements, and the true Controversy on their side is only this; 1. Whether the Body and Blood of Christ, prescinding from whatever Symbol is or may

* Stilling-
fleet Rom.
Idol p. 117.

may be there, is *adoreable*, as being present in the Sacrament with these symbols? (This is affirmed by *Catholicks*: more than this needs not be so;) And, 2. Whether the *Adoration of Christ's Body*, and so of Christ as present, if it should not be so, *will amount to Idolatry*?

§. 16.

If we here make a further enquiry into the Schoolmen concerning the Adoration or Veneration due to the Symbols, they state the same toward them as toward Images, the sacred Utensils, the H. name of *Jesus*, and other Holy things. *Omnes* (saith *Vasquez*, in 3. *Thom. tom.* 1. *dispt.* 108. c. 12.) *eodem modo de speciebus Sacramenti, quo de Imaginibus, philosophari debent.* And then of Images we know the Definition of the *Second Council of Nice* referred to by *Trent* — *non latria*. And for what they say of Images I refer you to the preceding Discourse on them, §. 42, &c. It is true, that some of the later Schoolmen (to defend the expressions of some of the former) have endeavoured to show how a latrical, qualified, secondary co-adoration may *improprie* or *per accidens* be said to be given to the symbols also, as sacramentally joyned with our Lord's Body, and as this body is as it were vested with them; such as, say they, when Christ was adored here on Earth, was given also to his Garments, *i. e.* without making in the act of worship a mental separation of his Person from his Cloths; as *Bellarmin* explains it, *de Euchar.* l. 4. c. 29. — *Neque enim* (saith he) *jubebant Christum vestibus nudari antequam adorarent; aut animo & cogitatione separabant a vestibus cum adorarent; sed simpliciter Christum, ut tunc se habebat, adorabant: tametsi ratio adorandi non erant vestes, imo nec ipsa Humanitas, sed sola Divinitas.* Or do allow the giving of the external sign of *Latria* to them: as Bowing to, Kissing, Embracing them; but this without any the least internal act of *latria*, or any other honour or submission directed to them, which such inanimate things are incapable of; as *Vasquez* explains it; who is so prodigal of this external sign of honour, after he hath stript it of any internal *latria*, or other worship whatever that may accompany it; that he allows this external sign not only to all Holy things, but to any Creature whatever, (in our inward adoration mean-while only of God,) upon the general relation they have to him. But indeed such an abstraction of the external sign, from an internal honour or respect (as other *Catholicks* censure his opinion) makes these outward gestures, without any mental intention attending them as to such object, like those of a Puppet or Engine, utterly insignificant: and so *Vasquez*, instead of communicating the *latria* to Images,

to

to the Symbols, to other Holy things, seems, in the judgment of others, to allow them no honour or veneration at all; and so, in seeming to say too much, to say too little; which hath been more largely discoursed before, *Of Images* §. 42. &c. And a late Author * *Stillingsfleet Rom. Idol* p. 129. might have done well, in mentioning this Author's Opinion, to have given also a true relation of it, affirming only an external sign of honour given to the creature void of any internal the least respect to them; *Ita ut tota mentis intentio in Exemplar, non in Imaginem* [or, Deum, non Creaturam] feratur: which would easily have taken away all that malignity he fastens upon it. This for *Vasquez*. And as for *Bellarmin's* adoration *improprie* and *per accidens*, Bishop *Forbes* tells us l. 2. c. 2. §. 11. *Sententia ista Bellarmini plurimis Doctoribus Romanensibus displicet*. And *Bellarmin* himself, as appears by the former citations, waving these School disputes, tells us, — *Status Questionis non est nisi*, An Christus in Eucharistia sit adorandus? i. e. no more is defined, decided, imposed on Christians faith by the Church, than this: nor more needs be disputed with, or maintained against, Protestants, than this. [This in the 2d. place from §. 11. Of Catholics professing their Adoration with divine worship of Christ, only present in the Sacrament with the Symbols, not of the Symbols; or, not, of the Sacrament, if taken for the Symbols.]

3ly. Therefore also Catholics ground their Adoration (a thing §. 17. Cardinal *Perron* much insists upon in his Reply to King *James*) not on Transubstantiation, (tho both Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation involve it; so that, either of these maintained, Adoration necessarily follows) as if, Transubstantiation defeated, Adoration is so too; but on a Real Presence with the Symbols; which in general is agreed on by the *Lutheran* together with them. Which Adoration they affirm due, with all the same circumstances where-with it is now performed, tho' Christ's Body were present with the Symbols, neither as under the accidents of Bread, as they say; nor under the substance of Bread, as the *Lutheran* faith; but, tho' after some other unknown manner, distinct from both: and if they were convinced of the error of Transubstantiation, and of the truth of the presence of the substance of the Bread unchanged; yet as long as not confuted in the point of *Real Presence*, they would never the less for this continue to adore the self same Object, as now, in the self same place, namely, the Body of Christ still present there with the Symbols, and therefore there adorable; tho' present after another manner than they imagined. See the argument of *Barnesius* a Roman Writer apud *Forbes*. l. 2. c. 2. §. 12. Corpus

Corpus Christi est cum pane vel permanente, vel transeunte, uno vel alio modo, & per consequens non est idololatria adorare Christum ibi in Eucharistia realiter presentem. See in *Conc. Trid.* 13. §. c. 5. the reason immediately following the requiring of Adoration, — *Nam illum eundem Deum presentem in eo [i. e. Sacramento] adesse credimus, quem Pater introducens in orbem terrarum dicit, Et adorent eum, &c.*

If therefore the *Roman* Church enjoyns these three: 1. To believe *Christ's Corporal presence* in the Sacrament. 2. To believe such presence *by way of Transubstantiation*. 3. To adore *Christ* as being there present: It follows not that she enjoyns the third in order to the second: but may only, in order to the first; as the first being (without the second) a sufficient ground thereof. Neither can I, disbelieving the second, yet believing the first, refuse obedience to the third, that is, to worship the same object in the same place, as those do who also believe the second; and in my believing both the first and the second, yet may I nevertheless ground the third only on that, which is by Christians more generally agreed on; and still worship out of no other intention, after Transubstantiation believed, than I did before I believed it (when only I held in general a corporal presence) or than others do; who, believing a Real presence, do not yet believe Transubstantiation.

§. 18. 4. Let us, then, not granting it, suppose Transubstantiation an error; yet if the tenent of Corporal or Real presence (as held by the *Lutherans*, or others) be true, *Catholicks* plead, *their Adoration is no way frustrated, but still warrantable*, and to be continued.

§. 19. 5ly. Suppose not only Transubstantiation, but Real presence an error, and the *Lutheran* and the *Roman* Catholick both mistaken; yet there can be *no pretence why these later*, in such Adoration, (grounded by both on Real presence with the Symbols) *will not be as excusable from Idolatry as the other.* For, thus far these two Parties agree: 1. That *Christ is corporally present*: 2. That *he may be worshipped*: 3. That *no other there but He may be worshipped*; not Bread, nor any other meer creature: 4. That *nothing visible in the Sacrament is He, or his Body*; which is present only invisibly, without any thing visible, inhering, or appertaining to it, as the subject thereof. They differ only about the manner of the presence of this invisible Substance. The one saith, it is there together with the Bread; the other saith there, instead of the Bread, and the Bread away; a thing also to God possible, for any thing we know. The one saith, he is there both under the substance and accidents of

of Bread ; the other, there under the accidents only of the bread. Now, whilst both worship the same Object in the same place, and veiled with the same sensible accidents, if the one adoring him as being under the substance of bread, (he not being there) are freed from any Idolatry in such worship ; the other adoring him as being under the accidents of bread, (he not being there) cannot be made hereby Idolaters : since they say, and freely profess, that, if his body be not there, under those appearances, but the same substance still under them which was formerly ; then they confess it a creature, and renounce all adoration of it.

Whereas therefore it is objected, That the substance of bread only being in that place, where they suppose Christ's Body, and not any Bread, to be, therefore in worshipping the thing in that place, they worship bread ; this were a right charge, if they affirmed, that they worshipped the substance that is in that place under such accidents *whatever* it be : but this none say ; but, that they worship it only upon supposition that it is Christ's Body, and not bread, and that for this supposition they have a rational ground, (of which by and by.) Now, saying they worship it, because it is so, is saying, if it be not so, they intend no worship to it. He that saith, I give divine Adoration to that which is under the *species* of Bread, because believed by me, or, if you will, certainly known by me (but he, indeed, mistaking) to be Christ's Body, and so Christ present, is yet far from saying, I worship whatever is under the *species* of Bread, whether it be Christ's Body or no. And he that saith the later of these, if bread happen to be there, is willingly granted an ἀπὸλαρῶ ; but not so the former.

Daille, as it much concerns him, excuseth a *Lutheran* adoring upon a falsely supposed real or corporal presence of our Lord, from any Idolatry, for this reason : Because, saith he, * *such adoration is mistaken not in this, — that it addresseth it self to an Object not adora-* * 1. Reply
to Chau-
mont, p. 63.
ble, but only that by error it seeks and thinks to enjoy it in a place where it is not, and so he saith it becomes only vain and unprofitable, &c. as is said before §. 8. The same therefore must he allow to *Catholicks*, if meaning nothing more by their Language of *Adoratio Sacramenti* than *Christi in Sacramento* ; as hath been shewed before §. 12. &c. that they do not : and that the contention about this is a meer *Logomachy* ; and that they also, as the others, ground their Adoration not on Transubstantiation, but Corporal Presence.

As for *Costerus*, or perhaps some other *Roman* Writers, that say, §. 20.
if Transubstantiation [where also they must mean, or a Corporal Pre-

sence, *some other way*] were not true, the Idolatry of Heathens is much more excusable, than of Christians, that worship a bit of bread : they do not, or at least are not necessitated to grant the consequence necessary, that, if Transubstantiation or Corporal Presence fail, then they must adore the bread ; which bread mean while they deny also to be there : no more than *Protestants* do or think themselves necessitated to grant this consequence, That if Consubstantiation or Corporal Presence fail, then the *Lutherans* do adore the Bread ; which bread also tho' the *Lutherans* affirm to be there, yet do other *Protestants* deny that the *Lutherans* worship. But *Costerus*, and others, only maintain this : That, supposing that which is imposed upon them, *viz.* that *Catholicks*, if there be no Transubstantiation, do worship a bit of bread ; the Heathen Idolatry, in their worshipping a golden or silver Image, or some living creature, &c. would be far more tolerable, and more noble. Shewing by this (as Dr. Taylor expresseth it, *Liberty of Prophesying*, p. 258.) That they are so far from worshipping the bread in such case, that themselves profess it to be Idolatry to do so ; and intending, by advancing this fault the higher, the more to make appear the impossibility of such an error, its for so many hundred years possessing the Universal Church of Christ, assisted by our Saviour to the end of the World, and the Pillar of Truth : and thinking the greatness of this crime a good argument of the Churches innocency therein ; whilst perhaps, in some smaller matters, she might be liable to a mistake. I do believe (saith Mr. Thorndike, *Epilog.* 3. l. 30. c. p. 353.) that it hath been said by great Doctors of the Church of Rome, that they must needs think themselves flat Idolaters, if they could think that the Elements are not abolished : That shews with what confidence they would have the World apprehend, that they hold their opinion ; but not, that the consequence is true ; unless that which I have said be reprovable. And again, in *Just weights* c. 19. — When they say they must be flat Idolaters, if the Elements be there, zeal to their opinion makes them say more than they should say. — Lastly, If *Costerus* saith, that Transubstantiation failing, *Catholicks* do worship the bread, *Bellarmin de Eucha.* l. 4. c. 30. and others, say just the contrary, arguing thus concerning a *Catholick's* worshipping an unconsecrated Host, which is nothing but bread, — *Adoratio ex intentione* [i. e. such as is rationally grounded] *potissimum pendet.* Quare qui [talem] panem adorat, quod certo credat non esse panem sed Christum, is proprie & formaliter Christum adorat, non panem. Which may as well be said of an Host consecrated, that is not Transubstantiated (when the adorer upon probable grounds believes.

believes it to be so,) but remains still bread, — *Qui hunc panem adorat, quod certo credat non esse panem, sed Christum, is proprie & formaliter Christum adorat, non panem.* And the same, much-what, as by Bellarmin, is said by Dr. Hammond, *Disc. of Idolatry*, §. 64. That, supposing their error be grounded on an honest and blameless misunderstanding of Scripture, it is, tho' material, yet perhaps in them not formal Idolatry; because, if they were not verily perswaded that it were God, they profess they would never think of worshipping it. Thus he.

This in the 5th. place of not only Transubstantiation, but Real Presence being supposed an error, yet that the Roman practice, or error, compared with the Lutheran, the first is no more peccant than the later; and therefore that the Lutheran by Protestants being excused from Idolatry, so ought the Roman Catholick too.

6. Both these being supposed errors, and indeed no Presence of Christ's Body with the Symbols at all, as is by them both imagined there; yet, such Adoration, by the one or the other, of Christ, who is a true object of supreme Adoration, and only by them mistaken to be in some place where he is not, cannot be termed any such Idolatry, as is the worshipping of an object not at all adorable. So, for example, If we suppose a Heathen worshipping a Heathen-God, as having some particular residence in an Image; or an Israelite worshipping the true God of Israel, as having a special residence in the Calf at Sinai; or in Jeroboam's Calves, called also by him *Cherubims*; or lastly, a Manichean, mistaking nothing in the Nature or Attributes of our Lord Christ, save that he thinks him to have some particular residence in the Sun, and so worshipping him as present there: None of these would be any such Idolatry, or parallel to it, as that of another Heathen worshipping the very Molten Image; or Israelite worshipping the very Calf for his God; or Manichean worshipping the Sun it self for Christ. Again; neither can any of these that adore only God or Christ as specially present where indeed he is not, (e.g. as fancied God so present in the Calf, or Christ in the Sun,) if we suppose something else invisibly and undiscerned by him to be there present, as if we imagine an Angel in the Sun, or a Serpent within the Calf, therefore be said to adore such Angel, or Serpent: and whatever fault may be in such worship, yet it would be great injustice to accuse such Israelite or Manichean, of adoring such Angel or Serpent upon this indefinite Proposition, that he professeth to worship that which he believes to be present there; especially if such person do also declare against the adoration of any such particular things, if, contrary to his belief,

lief, there present. Neither then can it be justly deduced from a *Lutheran's* or *Catholic's* adoring Christ as under the substance or *species* of Bread, that therefore these adore the thing it self that is present under them.

§. 22.

7. Whatever fault or also Idolatry it may be called (tho' not so gross as the former) in a *Manichean* that worships Christ in the Sun, or in an *Israelite* that worships God as specially present or resident in the Calves of *Dan* and *Bethel* or that at *Sinai*, because it is adoring a fancy of their own, without any rational ground or pretence thereof; and however meerly a good intention grounded upon a culpable ignorance can excuse none from Idolatry, or any other fault, (which as it is often pressed by *Protestants*, is freely granted by *Catholics*.) Yet since *Daille* (and, I suppose, other *Protestants* with him) doth allow, not an absolutely certain, but a reasonable, tho' mistaken ground or motive of Adoration, sufficient for avoiding the just imputation of Idolatry, [upon which account a Disciple adoring with divine worship a person very much resembling our Saviour, when he was upon Earth; or, supposing a consecrated Host truly adorable, one, who adores an Host placed on the Altar, and by some deficiency in the Priest, not truly consecrated, is freely absolved by them herein from committing any Idolatry. See before §. 8.] Hence therefore if *Catholics* can produce a rational ground of their apprehending Christ present in the Eucharist, tho' possibly mistaken in it, they are to be excused from Idolatry, upon the same terms.

§. 23.

(1.) Now here first; the *Lutherans* being allowed to have such a plausible ground or motive for their Adoration, whereby they become by other *Protestants* absolved from Idolatry in adoring our Lord as present there, (only their Adoration inutile (saith *Daille*) & tombent en neant,) I see not why the ground of *Roman Catholics* should be any whit less valued than theirs. For, if we compare the one's Con-- with the other's Trans--substantiation, the later seems more agreeable to our Lord's words, *Hoc est Corpus meum*; and to the most plain literal obvious sense thereof, *Hoc est Corpus meum*, by a change of the Bread, rather than, *Hoc est Corpus meum*, by a conjunction with the Bread; and therefore is the *Roman* equalled with, or else preferred before, the *Lutheran* sense by many *Protestants*, that are neutral and dissent from both. [Longius Consubstantiatorum (saith Bishop *Forbes*, de Euchar. l. 1. c. 4 §. 5.) quam Transsubstantiatorum sententiam a Christi verbis recedere, sive litera spectetur, sive sensus, affirmat R. Hospinianus & ceteri Calviniani communiter. And *Hospinian*, Histor. Sacram. 2. part. fol. 6. saith of

of Luther, — *Errorum errore commutavit, nec videns suam opinionem non habere plus, imo etiam minus coloris, quam Scholasticorum & Papa.* And see the same judgment of the *Helvetian Ministers*, and *Calvin*, *apud Haspinian. f. 212.*] But next; *Catholicks* founding their Adoration not on Transubstantiation, but on Corporal Presence, the same common ground of this they have with *Lutherans*, viz. *our Lord's words implying*; and so it must excuse both, or neither.

(2.) Laying aside this comparison, let us view more particular-ly what *rational ground* *Catholicks* exhibit of this their belief of a Corporal Presence in the Eucharist, and so of Adoration. S. 24

I. This their Ground then of such a Corporal Presence in the Eucharist (after a possibility thereof, granted also by sober Protestants*) is pretended to be *Divine Revelation*, and if it be so as pretended, then no argument from our senses, and against it, *valid*: and that (as was said but now) taken in its most plain, literal, natural, and grammatical sense, in the words, *Hoc est Corpus meum*; so often iterated in the Gospel, and again by *S. Paul*, without any variation or change, or explication of that which yet is pretended by *Calvinists* to be a metaphorical expression; and such, if we will believe them, as this, that the *Church is his Body*, Eph. 1.23. or, *He the true Vine*, Joh. 15.1. A great argument this, (the Apostles punctual retaining still, in their expressing the Institution thereof, the same language and words) that our Lord intended it literally, as he spoke it. Pretended also to be *Divine Revelation* from many other Scriptures, (the citing and pressing of which takes up all *Belarmin's* first Book *de Eucharistia*, to which I refer the inquisitive Reader:) but especially from the Discourse *Jo. 6.* Which Apostle writing his Gospel so late, when the Communion of our Lord's Body and Blood was so much frequented and celebrated in the Church, seems therefore to have omitted the mention of it at all in his story of the Passion, and the time of its first Institution: because he had dilated so much upon it before in relating a Sermon of our Lord's made in *Gallilee* about the time of the yearly Feast of eating the Paschal Lamb, *Jo. 6. 4, &c.* — *The literal and grammatical sense of which Divine Revelation* (saith *Dr. Taylor*, *Liberty of Prophecy*, §. 20. p. 258.) *if that sense were intended, would warrant Catholicks to do violence to all the Sciences in the circle. And that Transubstantiation is openly and violently against natural Reason, would be no argument to make them disbelieve, who believe the mystery of the Trinity in all those niceties of explication which are in the Schools, (and which now adays pass for the Doctrine of*

the

* See Guide in Controversy, Disc. 1. §. 62.

the Church,) [or he might have said, which are in the *Athanasian Creed*,] with as much violence to the principles of natural and supernatural Philosophy, as can be imagined to be in the point of Transubstantiation. And elsewhere (*Real Presence*, p. 240.) saith, as who will not say? — That if it appear, that God hath affirmed Transubstantiation, he for his part will burn all his Arguments against it, and make publick Amends.

§. 25.

II. Again ; Catholics have for their Rational ground of following this sense, in opposition to any other given by Sectaries, the Declaration of it by the most Supreme and Universal Church-Authority that hath been assembled in former times for the decision of this controverſie long before the birth of *Protestantism* ; a brief account of which Councils, to the number of seven or eight (if the 2d. *Nicene* [*Act. 6. tom. 3.*] be reckoned with the rest) before that of *Trent*, all agreeing in the same sentence, see concerning the *Guide in Controversy*, *Disc. 1. §. 57, &c.* [Out of the number of which Councils said to establish such a Doctrine, as Bishop *Cosins*, *Hist. Transub. c. 7. p. 149.* after many others, hath much laboured to subduet the great *Lateran* Council under *Innocent 3.* upon pretence of the reputed Canons thereof their being proposed therein only by the Pope, but not passed or confirmed by the Council ; so another late Protestant Writer upon another Protestant interest, viz. out of the 3d. Canon of the same Council, charging not only the Pope but the Councils themselves, and the Catholic Religion, as invading the Rights of Princes, hath with much diligence very well vindicated these Canons against the others, as the true Acts of this Great Assembly, and not only the designs of the Pope ; and copiously shewed them (as in truth they were) owned as such, both in the same, and the following times. And thus the Doctrine of Transubstantiation in this Council is firmly established, whilst Catholics contend, in the other Canon concerning *Secular Powers*, the Sense of the Council is by Protestants mistaken.

Mr. Dodwel Considerations of present controversy. § 31. P. 165.

Now upon this, I ask what more reasonable or secure course in matters of Religion, (whether as to Faith or Practice) can a private and truly humble Christian take, than, where the sense of a Divine Revelation is disputed, to submit to that interpretation thereof, which the Supreme Authority in the Church, that hath been heretofore convened about such matters, hath so often and always in the same manner decided to him ; and so to act according to its Injunctions ?

§. 26.

III. But, if these Councils be declined as not being so ancient as some may expect ; i. e. not held before some controversy hapned in

in the Church touching the point they decided, *Catholicks* still have another very *Rational* ground of such a sense of the Divine Writ, viz. *the evident testimony of the more Primitive times*. Which that they have conveyed the Tradition of such a sense to the present Church, and to these former Councils, (to repeat what hath been said already in *Considerations* on the Council of Trent, §. 321. n. 1. because perhaps by scarcity of copies that Book may come to few hands) I think will be clear to any one, not much interested, that shall at his leisure spend a few hours in a publick Library to read, entire, and not by quoted parcels, the discourses on this Subject; Of St. *Ambros. de Myster. init. cap. 9.* -- the Author *de Sacramentis*, ascribed to the same Father, 4. l. 4, and 5. Chapters. -- *Cyrl. Hierosol. Cateches. Mystagog. 4, & 5.* -- *Chrysost in Matt. Hom. 83.* -- *In Act. Hom. 21.* -- *In 1 Cor. Hom. 24.* -- *Greg. Nissen. Orat. Catechet. ch. 36, 37.* -- *Enseb. Emissen. or Casarius Arelatensis de Paschate, Sermon. 5.* -- *Hilarius Pictav. de Trinitate*, the former part of the 8th. Book. -- *Cyrl. Alexand. in Evangel. Joan. l. 10. c. 13.* Concerning the authenticalness of which pieces enough also hath been said elsewhere.

IV. In a consequence of, and succession from, this doctrine of §. 27. those Primitive times, and of the later Councils of the Church, when this Point was brought into some Dispute and Controversie, a Catholick hath for a *Rational* ground of his Faith, and practice, *the universal doctrine and practice of the later* both Eastern and Western Churches till Luther's time, and at the present also, excepting his followers. For the Eastern Churches (disputed by some Protestants) both their belief of a *corporal presence* with the Symbols, and practice of *Adoration*, see what hath been said at large in the *Guide in Controversy, disc. 3. c. 8.* (where also are exhibited the testimonies of many learned Protestants freely conceding it) and again, in *Considerations* on the Council of Trent, §. 321. n. 22. p. 313. and n. 9. p. 294. See also the late eminent evidences of the Faith and Practice of these Eastern Churches at this day, collected by Monsieur *Arnaud*, in his two replies to *Claude*; a brief account whereof also is given in the *Guide, Disc. 3. §. 81. n. 2, &c.* In which matter (whereas one of the chiefest and commonest Pleas of Protestants is the Greek and Eastern Churches their according with them, whereby they seem to out-number the Roman) if any will but take the courage, notwithstanding his secular Interest, candidly to examin it, I doubt not he will receive a full Satisfaction.

Lastly,

* *Eclaircissement
sur l'Eucharistie* c.
15.

* See *Ibid.*
c. 18.

Lastly, see D. *Blondel* (one much esteemed by Protestants, for his knowledge in ancient Church-History) granting an alteration in the Doctrine concerning our Lord's Presence in the Eucharist (an Alteration he means from that which is now maintained by Protestants, and was by the former Antiquity) begun in the Greek Church after A. D. 754. * *i. e.* begun so soon as any dispute hapned in the Eastern Church concerning this Presence; which dispute was first occasion'd there upon an Argument which was taken from the Eucharist, and urged against Images by the Council of *Constantinople*, under *Constantinus Copronymus*, and was contradicted by *Damascen*, and shortly by the 2d. *Nicene Council*. In which opinion of the 2d. *Nicene Council* and *Damascen*, *Blondel* freely acknowledgeth the Greek Churches to have continued to this day. See c. 16. p. 399. Again, granting an Alteration in the same Doctrine (as is said before) begun in the Western Church A. D. 818. * *i. e.* as soon as the like dispute hapned about this Point in the Western Parts: which dispute there was occasioned by the Council held at *Frankfort* under *Charles the Great*, opposing the expressions of the fore said *Constantinopolitan Council* in like manner as the 2d. *Nicene Council* had done before. Lastly, if we ask him, what this Alteration in the East first, and afterward in the West, was; 1. He maketh it much-what the same in both. And then he explains it to be a kind of Impanation, or Consubstantiation, or Assumption of the Bread by our Lord Christ. His words, c. 19. are these *Des l' An. 818. &c.* — *Some among the Latins did (as it were in imitation of the Greek) conceive a kind of Consubstantiation, partly like, partly unlike, to what many Germans [he means Lutherans] now maintain; which, to speak properly, ought to be called Impanation, or Assumption of the Bread by the Word of God.* And c. 20. he goes on, — *The opinion of Paschasius, [whom he makes Leader in the Western, as Damascen in the Greek Church] had advanced before A. D. 900. an Impanation of the Word, fortified and getting credit by degrees; the establishment of which (saith he p. 440.) both Damascen and Paschasius designed.* Wherein (he saith p. 441.) they supposed a kind of Identity between the Sacrament and the Natural Body of Christ, founded upon the inhabitation of the Deity in them; which at last produced, he saith, the establishment of Transubstantiation, under Pope *Innocent the Third*.

Here then 1. We see granted, both of the *Greek* and *Latin Church*, the same Tenent. 2. We may observe, that this Tenent of *Impanation* he imposeth on them, when well examined, is found much

much more gross and absurd than that of *Transubstantiation*: For which see what is said in *Bellarmin, de Euchar. l. 3. c. 13. & 15.* Or in *Suarez, de Sacrament. Disp. 49.* But 3. see in *Considerations on the Council of Trent* §. 321. n. 13. and n. 16. &c. that this Doctrine of *Damascen* and the *Greek Church*, and afterwards of *Paschasius* and the *Latin*, before *Innocent the Third's* time, was plain *Transubstantiation*; and is misrepresented by *Blondel* for *Impanation*; and therefore never hath the *Greek Church* hitherto had any contest or clashing with the *Roman* concerning this point. And see the concessions also of other Protestants very frequent and more candid, of *Transubstantiation* held by the *Greek Churches* of later times, as well as by the *Roman*, produced in the *Rational Account concerning the Guide in Controversies*, Disc. 3. c. 8. 4ly. Lastly, these Churches, in which, he saith, such an Alteration was made from the former Doctrine of Antiquity, deny it at all so to be; and affirm, that, when some new opinions appeared, they maintained and vindicated it as the Doctrine of the Fathers; their Proofs of it being also extracted out of the Fathers Testimonies. Now then to stand against such a strong stream of both East and West running constantly in this course, seems to *Catholicks*, with *S. Austin* very unreasonable. — *Similiter etiam* (saith he, Epist. 118. Januario) *siquid horum tota per orbem frequentat Ecclesia: nam & hinc, quin ita faciendum sit, disputare, insolentissime insania est.* And, — *Græci omnes* (saith Bishop *Forbes, de Euchar. l. 2. c. 2.*) [as well as the *Roman Church*] *adorant Christum in Eucharistia: Et quis ausit omnes hos Christianos Idololatriæ arcessere & damnare?*

V. Lastly; besides this great Body, *Catholicks* have since *Lu. S. 28.* *ther's* time, in the Reformation, no small number of Protestants, I mean such as are the genuine Sons of the Church of *England*, proceeding thus far, as to confess both a *Real Presence* of our Lord's Body and Blood in the Eucharist, and *Adoration* of it as present there; a real presence of it to each worthy Receiver, tho' not to the Elements. And *Hooker*, if he mistook not the Doctrine of the Church of *England* in his time, saith, *Eccles. Pol. l. 5. §. 67.* — *Wherefore should the world continue still distracted, and rent with so many manifold Contentions, when there remaineth now no Controversy, saving only about the subject where Christ is? — Nor doth any thing rest doubtful in this, but whether, when the Sacrament is administered, Christ be whole within Man only, or else his Body and Blood be also externally seated in the very consecrated Elements themselves.* So that, if *Hooker* and his party are in the right, *Catholicks* do not mistake Christ's Body as present in a place where it is not; but

only in thinking it in that present to one thing, the Elements, when it is so only to another, the Receiver of them. But then the same Catholicks have another half of the Reformation, viz. all the *Lutheran* Protestants, that affirm, with the *Roman* Church, Christ's Body present also to the Elements, or Symbols. And see Mr. *Thorndike* also, *Epilog.* l. 3. c. 3. much for this presence of Christ's Body to be *in, with, or under* the Elements, immediately upon, and by the consecration of them, (which consecration also he placeth (l. 3. 4. c. p. 24.) in the blessing of the Elements before the breaking, &c. mentioned before §. 7.). Look back now upon all these Pleas of Catholicks, and see if they will not make up at least a *reasonable ground* or motive of their Adoration. A reasonable ground; I say not here (what I might) sufficient to secure their faith from all suspicion of error, but (which serves my purpose) to secure them from Idolatry in their Adoration, tho' they should be mistaken; when as other persons, because proceeding on like reasonable motives, are by Protestants, in their Adoration of a mistaken Presence, or Object, excused from it; (See before §. 8.) As, for example, the *Lutheran*; the Adorer of one much resembling our Lord here on Earth; the Adorer of an unconsecrated Host, or Wafer placed on the Altar, &c. especially when Catholicks in crediting such divine Revelation of Christ's Presence, and so for their Adoration, receive no contradiction (as it is pretended they do) from their senses: because they adore, I mean with divine Adoration, nothing visible, or sensible at all, nor any substance invisible wherein any thing that occurs to their senses inheres; but only understand Christ's Body present there, where their senses can no way certainly, and against any pretended divine Revelation, inform them, either when it is present, or not; since *salvis omnibus phenomenis*, all appearances granted most true, such a Presence is possible.

§. 29.

These rational Grounds of *Catholicks* for Adoration, which we expected should have been most strictly examined by those who conclude the *Roman* practice herein Idolatry, are slightly passed over by *Daille*, in pronouncing that this error of Catholicks *vient toute entiere de leur passion*, *Apolog. des Eglis Reform.* c. 11. p. 90. And after in reducing all their ground thereof to a — *la seule autorite du Pape & de son Concile*: and by Dr. *Taylor*, *Real Pres.* §. 13. p. 346. in calling them — *some trifling pretences made out of some sayings of the Fathers*. Elsewhere indeed, when he was in a more charitable temper (*Liberty of Prophef.* p. 258.) he saith, *That for a motive to such an opinion, Roman Catholicks have a divine Revelation, whose literal and grammatical Sense, if that Sense was*

intended, would warrant them to do violence to all the Sciences in the Circle: but prudently there omits their Plea of Catholick Tradition, securing to them such a literal sense of the Text. Dr. Stillingfleet (Rom. Idol. c. 2. §. 7.) saith first, —That, if a mistake in this case will excuse the Romanist, it would excuse the grossest Idolatry in the World. And in comparing two persons, one worshipping Christ as really present in the Sun, another, Christ as really present in the Sacrament, he saith, as inconsiderately as magisterially, —That supposing a mistake in both, we are not to enquire into the reasons of the mistake, [i. e. as he saith before, concerning the probability of the one mistake, more than of the other] but the influence it hath upon our actions. So he. But, what is more manifest, than that the influence which a mistake hath upon our actions, as to making them culpable or innocent, is not always the same, but very various, and often contrary; rendring them sometimes blameless, sometimes faulty, according as the mistake is error in-excusable? Next, he grants Ibid. §. 5. a Catholick Tradition of Transubstantiation to be a sufficient ground for Adoration: But the Catholick Tradition that is pleaded here necessary for Adoration, is only that of a corporal Presence. Now, for a sufficient evidence of such a Tradition, I refer the conscientious Reader to what hath been said before, waving that of Transubstantiation as to this Controversy, tho' the same Catholick Tradition authorizeth both; namely, a corporal Presence by a mutation of the Elements into our Lord's Body. This from §. 24. Of the Rational grounds Catholics have for their Adoration.

8ly. For such Rational grounds therefore of their worship as are here given (and not from any excess of Charity, or from the singular Fancies of some few, tho' learned men, as Dr. Stillingfleet, in his Preface to Roman Idolatry would insinuate) Idolatry is by many Protestants of late, either not at all, or but faintly charged on the Church of Rome. For first, see Mr. Thorndike in his Epilogue, 3. l. 30. c. p. 350. —*I say first (saith he) that the Adoration of the Eucharist, which the Church of Rome prescribeth, is not necessarily Idolatry. I say not, what it may be accidentally by that intention which some men may conceal, and may make it Idolatry as to God: but I speak upon supposition of that intention, which the profession of the Church formeth. And in his Just Weights, c. 19. p. 125. —They who give the honour proper to God to his Creature, are Idolaters; they that worship the Host give the honour due to God to his Creature: this is taken for a Demonstration, that the worship of the Host is Idolatry. But will any Papist acknowledge, that he honours the Elements of the Eucharist,*

§. 30.

rist, or, as he thinks, the Accidents of them for God? Will common Reason charge him to honour that, which he believes not to be there? If they were there, they would not take them for God; and therefore they would not honour them for God: And that is it. (not saying that they should be Idolaters if the Elements did remain) that must make them Idolaters. And Epilogue p. 357. in general he saith; — *Whoso admits Idolatry, [i. e. in any point whatever] to be taught by the Roman Church, can by no means grant it to be a Church; the very being whereof supposeth the worship of one God, exclusive to anything else. The Roman Church, then, must either be freed from the imputation of commanding any thing that is Idolatry, (i. e. adoration of a creature for God); or we must affirm, there to be, and to have been, no true Church of Christ, never since such command of that which they say is Idolatry went forth, (which no judicious Protestant, I think, hath or dare say of the Roman Church, since the beginning of the Adoration of the Eucharist:). For what Church or Sect of Religion can be Apostate at all, if not a Church committing, and commanding Idolatry; even the worshipping of a piece of Bread, which themselves made, for that God which made them and Heaven and Earth.*

And thus Bishop Forbes, de Euchar. l. 2. c. 2. *Perperam ἀπολατρεία Romanensibus a plerisque Protestantibus obicitur, & illi Idololatriæ crassissima & gravissima ab his insimulantur & damnantur; cum plerique Romanenses, ut & alii fideles, credant panem consecratum non esse amplius panem, sed corpus Christi; unde illi non panem adorant: sed tantum ex suppositione, licet falsa, non tamen hæretica, aut impia, vel cum fide directè pugnante, ut superiore libro ostensum est, Christi corpus, quod vere adorandum est, adorant. In Eucharistia enim mente discernendum esse Christum a visibili signo docent ipsi; & Christum quidem adorandum esse, non tamen Sacramentum, quia species illa sunt res creata & inanimæ, & consequenter incapaces adorationis. And Ibid. shewing the Greek and Eastern Church, as well as the Roman, to use it, he concludes, *Quis ausit omnes hos Christianos Idololatriæ arcessere & damnare?* After the same manner the Archbishop of Spalato, de Repub. Eccles. 7. l. 11. c. n. 6. — *Respondeo (saith he) me nullum idololatricum crimen in adoratione Eucharistia, si rectè dirigatur intentio, agnoscere. Qui enim docent, panem non esse amplius panem, sed corpus Christi, illi profecto panem non adorant: sed solum ex suppositione, licet falsa, Christi corpus vere adorabile adorant. Non enim nostri dicunt species panis & vini, hoc est, accidentia illa esse adoranda.**

Bishop Bramhal, cited before, §. 6. — *The Sacrament is to be adored, said the Council of Trent. The Sacrament, i. e. formally the Body and Blood of Christ say some of your Authors: we say the same. — The Sacrament, i. e. the species of Bread and Wine say others: that we deny.* Thus he.

D. Taylor, in his *Liberty of Prophecy*, p. 258. confesseth the Subjects of the Church of Rome no Idolaters in this kind; at least so as to worship Bread or any creature with Divine Worship, and as God: For, — *It is evident, saith he, that the Object of their Adoration (that which is represented to them in their minds, their thoughts, and purposes, and by which God principally, if not solely, takes estimate of humane actions) in the Blessed Sacrament, is the only true and eternal God, hypostatically joyned with his holy Humanity; which Humanity they believe actually under the veil of the Sacramental signs. And if they thought Him not present, they are so far from worshipping the Bread in this case, that themselves profess it to be Idolatry to do so; which is a demonstration that their soul hath nothing in it that is idololatrical, [i. e. as to the directing this their divine worship to an undue object.]*

Which things if said right by him and the others, the same Dr. S. 35. Taylor is faulty in his charge in *Real Presence*, p. 334. Faulty I say, in charging on the Church of Rome, not their worship of a right Object in a some-way unlawful and prohibited manner, this we are not here examining; but their worship of an undue Object of Adoration, of a creature instead of God: for so he chargeth them there. *If (saith he there) they be deceived in their own strict Article, [he means of Transubstantiation,] then it is certain, they commit an act of Idolatry in giving divine honour to a mere creature, the image, the Sacrament and representment of the Body of Christ.* Thus he. *When it is evident that the Object, &c. is the only true and eternal God, &c.* as he said before in the place cited, and must say if he will say truth. So, faulty is also Daille, (*Reply to Chaumont*, p. 63.) in his charging the Church of Rome to worship Bread, upon this arguing: *Catholicks adore that substance that is veiled with the accidents of Bread and Wine; but this substance is Bread: Ergo they adore Bread.* By which arguing he may as well prove the *Lutherans* in the Eucharist to adore a Worm or a Mite, thus: *The Lutherans adore that substance which is joyned with the Bread; but that substance is a Worm or Mite: (for such thing may be there with the Bread at such time of Adoration) Ergo, they adore a Worm.* Whereas both the *Catholick* and *Lutheran* explain the indefinite term [*that which,*] used in the major Proposition,

sition, restrictively to the Body of Christ, and exclusively to any other substance whatever, that is, or may be, there, either with the Bread, or under its accidents. Faulty also is Dr. *Stillingsfleet*, *Rom. Idol. c. 2.* in saying the Protestants controversie with Catholicks is; *Whether proper Divine Worship, in the time of receiving the Eucharist, may be given to the Elements on the account of a corporal Presence under them*, p. 117. And, as for the passage in the Council of Trent, *sess. 13. c. 5.* urged by him there for it, his mistake is shewed before, §. 12. And so, faulty, in his concluding, p. 118. — *That the immediate term of that Divine Worship given by Catholicks, is the external and visible signs or elements.* And again, p. 124. *That, upon the principles of the Roman Church, no Man can be satisfied that he worships not a mere creature with divine honour, when he gives Adoration to the Host:* [whenas Catholicks expound themselves to mean by Host in their Adoration, not the Symbols, or *Sacramentum*, but *rem Sacramenti.*] Again, p. 125, 127, 129. — *That, supposing the Divine Nature present in any thing, gives no ground upon that account to give the same worship to the thing wherein it is present.* [Catholicks grant this as much as he: and doth not himself say several times, *That Catholicks condemn the worshipping of a mere creature for Idolatry?*] See §. 4. p. 120. — *If (saith he) it should be but a mere creature [that I adore,] all the World cannot excuse me from Idolatry, and my own Church [he means the Roman] condemns me; all agreeing that this is gross Idolatry.* Again; p. 119. *It is (saith he) a principle indisputable among them, [i. e. Catholicks,] that to give proper divine honour to a creature is Idolatry.* Again; p. 126. he saith, — *he finds it generally agreed by the Doctors of the Roman Church, that the Humane Nature of Christ considered alone, [i. e. without an Hypostatical union to the Divinity,] ought not to have divine honour given to it:* [and therefore neither any other creature whatever, that is not Hypostatically united, as none besides It is.] All these, I say, faulty and mistaken in charging the Church of Rome with this species of Idolatry, of worshipping a creature [*the Bread*] instead of Christ; from which the other Protestants clear it.

§. 32.

Lastly, Dr. *Hammond*, in his Treatise of Idolatry, §. 64. upon supposition that the ignorance or error of Catholicks is grounded on misunderstanding of Scripture, [*I add, so expounded to them by the supreme Church-Authority,*] seems to charge them rather with a material than a formal Idolatry; which material Idolatry in many cases is or may be committed without sin; as also material Adultery, and the like. His words are; — *That if it be demand-*
ed

ed, Whether in this case, that their ignorance or error be grounded on misunderstanding of Scripture, this so simple and not gross ignorance may serve for a sufficient antidote to allay the poison of such a sin of material, tho' perhaps in them not formal, Idolatry, &c. because if they were not verily perswaded that it were God, they profess they would never think of worshipping it? — he had no necessity to define and satisfy it, being only to consider what Idolatry is; and not how excusable ignorance or mistake can make it. And indeed Protestant Writers, that will have it to be Idolatry, are concerned to make it such a gentle one, as that the practice thereof, died in, and it neither particularly confessed, nor repented of, yet excludes not from Salvation; or else they must damn all those who lived in the visible communion of the Church Catholick for five or six hundred years, by their own confession.

9. Mean-while Catholicks willingly grant to Protestants that, §. 33- for which Daille's Apology of the Reformed Churches, c. 2. p. 98. much contendeth in their behalf: That to Adore that which the Adorer believes not to be our Lord, but Bread; or to perform the external signs of Adoration to our Lord as present there, where the worshipper believes he is not, is unlawful to be done by any, so long as the person continues so perswaded: For, *Conscientia erronea obligat*. But then, if we suppose the Church justly requiring such Adoration upon such a true Presence of our Lord; neither will the same person be free from sinning greatly in his following such his conscience, and in his not adoring: disobedience to the Churches just commands being no light offence. Neither for the yielding such obedience in general is it necessary that the Churches Subjects be absolutely certain of the rightness or lawfulness of the Churches Decrees or Commands: For, thus, the more ignorant in spiritual matters and the things commanded that any person is, the more free and released should he be from all obedience; the contrary of which is true. But sufficient it is even in the stating of judicious Protestant Divines, when writing against Puritans, (see *Considerations on the Council of Trent*, §. 295. n. 3, 4.) that such persons be not absolutely certain that the Churches commands are unjust, and that they do in something demonstratively contradict God's Law: which plain contradiction, if a private person can see it, 'tis strange the Church should not. And as to this particular matter, after the Churches motives of Adoration, that are delivered before, §. 24, &c. well considered, I leave the Reader to judge, whether such a pretended certainty can have any solid ground. It is better indeed to forbear an action, when we are not certain of the

law.

lawfulness thereof, provided that we are certain, that in such forbearance we do not sin. But thus certain of our not sinning in such forbearance we cannot be, concerning any thing that is enjoined us by our lawful and Canonical Superiors; whom we are obliged to obey: unless (as hath been said) we are first certain that such their command is unlawful.

S. 34.

And hitherto of this Controversie; where the Two main things that seem worthy to be examined, by any Christian, who in this point seeks satisfaction, are, 1. Whether the *Roman Catholick's grounds* of believing Christ's *Corporal Presence* in the Eucharist, with the Symbols, *are solid and true*. 2. And next; Whether this Church, *for any ones enjoying her Communion, exacts more* of him, than the *confessing* that Christ as present there *is also there to be adored*: whilst mean-while such person renounceth and declares against any adoration, or, if you will, co-adoration of the *species*, or any other thing whatever there present, with any *Latria* or supreme worship, proper or improper, or with any other honour or reverence, save only such an inferior veneration as is exhibited by us to other Holy Things.

F I N I S.
